R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 014 504 UD 002 467

A PROJECT TO PROVIDE TEACHER-SUPERVISOR TRAINING NEEDED TO IMPLEMENT IN 12 SCHOOLS SERVICING DISADVANTAGED PUPILS THE PHILOSOPHY, OBJECTIVES, CURRICULUM, BEING DEVELOPED FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN THE NEW TYPE OF INTERMEDIATE (MIDDLE) SCHOOL.

BY- TYREE, MARSHALL
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION, NEW YORK, N.Y.

PUB DATE 31 AUG 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.28 30P.

DESCRIPTORS- *MIDDLE SCHOOLS, *TRAINING, *SUPERVISORS, *TEACHER EDUCATION, DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, QUESTIONNARIES, *EVALUATION, INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION, NEW YORK CITY, ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS

TWO OF THE 10 SESSIONS OF A TEACHER AND SUPERVISOR TRAINING PROGRAM IN PREPARATION FOR THE OPENING OF SOME OF THE NEW YORK CITY PILOT INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS WERE EVALUATED. DATA CONSISTED OF OBSERVER REPORTS AND PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES. THE PARTICIPANTS MAINTAINED A HIGH LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT AND COOPERATION DURING BOTH SESSIONS. HOWEVER, THEY EXPRESSED SOME RESISTANCE BECAUSE OF THEIR APPREHENSION ABOUT TEAM TEACHING, THE EXTENT TO WHICH THEY COULD MASTER THE NONCONTENT OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAM, AND THE AVAILABILITY AND PROPER USE OF UNFAMILIAR TEACHING MATERIALS. (THE SPECIFIC REACTIONS OF THE PARTICIPANTS ARE INCLUDED ALONG WITH SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRES.) (NC)

ED014504

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street, New York

Educational Practices Division
Nathan Brown, Associate Director

Evaluation of New York City School District educational projects funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) · performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1965-66 School Year.

Joseph Krevisky
Research Coordinator, Title I Project

A PROJECT TO PROVIDE TEACHER-SUPERVISOR TRAINING NEEDED TO IMPLEMENT IN 12 SCHOOLS SERVICING DISADVANTAGED PUPILS THE PHILOSOPHY, OBJECTIVES, CURRICULUM, BEING DEVELOPED FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN THE NEW TYPE OF INTERMEDIATE (MIDDLE) SCHOOL.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

RE Dr. Marshall Tyree
Project Director

August 31, 1966

PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ... AS RECEIVED FROM THE
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY ... VIEW OR OPINIONS
POSITION OR POLICY.

UD 002 467

UD002467

Table of Contents

		Page
I	Project Description	1
II	Evaluation	3
III	The Training Sessions	
	Orientation Sessions	3
	Central	3
	Local	4
	Spring Training Sessions	5
	The Program	6
	The Participants	6
	Participants' Reactions	7
	Observers' Reactions	10
	August Workshops	12
	The Program	12
	The Participants	13
	Participants' Reactions	14
	Observers' Reactions	17
IV	Appendixes	
	Questionnaires	
	Evaluation Team	

Project Description

The Board of Education of the City of New York will open 14 Pilot Intermediate schools in September, 1966. In order to facilitate the operation of these schools, a training program for teachers and supervisors was conducted. The nature of the project, its objectives and procedure as described by the "Project Description," formulated by the Board of Education, is as follows:

> 4. NATURE OF THE PROJECT: In order to achieve "Excellence in Education," based on quality education in an integrated setting, a new type of Intermediate (Middle) School, will be initiated in September, 1966, in 12 *Intermediate Schools enrolling a high proportion of disadvantaged children. The design for the Intermediate School includes a new type of curriculum; more creative use of the school plant to meet individual needs of all children; changes in teaching assignments; the introduction of new materials, equipment and approaches to insure progress of all pupils.
>
> Because of the comprehensive nature of the changes planned, the staff of the 12 Intermediate Schools to be involved will need an effective teacher-supervisor training program during the spring and summer, 1966. In addition, selected personnel from the 58 Primary Schools sending pupils to the 12 Intermediate Schools will also need to be oriented in order to have an accurate understanding of the Intermediate School program.
>
> 5. OBJECTIVES:
>
> 5.1 To provide training for the staff of the 12 Intermediate Schools servicing a large number of disadvantaged children in order to develop a clear understanding of the new type of instructional program to be initiated in September, 1966.
>
> 5.2 To provide for the involvement of the staff of the 12 Intermediate Schools to open in September, 1966, in the programs and curriculum as they are being developed.
>
> 5.3 To provide orientation of selected personnel from the Primary Schools feeding the 12 Intermediate Schools in order to give these persons an understanding of the design of the new Intermediate Schools as a guide to their own teaching and as a basis for discussion with parents.

*Although 12 Pilot Intermediate Schools were originally designated, only 11 Pilot Intermediate Schools will be established.

6. PROCEDURE:

a. Program

6.1. For the Staffs of the 12 Intermediate Schools, the following teacher-supervisor orientation program will be planned;

6.1.1. Time Schedule: Workshops will be scheduled for 5 after-school sessions during April, May and June, and for 5 sessions during August.

6.1.2. Personnel: Participants in the program will include the following staff members from each of the 12 Intermediate Schools involved:

- All 5th and 6th grade teachers
- 6 teachers at the 7th-grade level
- 1 principal
- 3 assistant to principals
- 1 administrative assistant
- 2 lab assistants
- 1 school secretary
- guidance counselors
- special teachers (corrective reading, etc.)
- 6 demonstration teachers

Consultants in all subject areas of the curriculum will be used at these sessions. The consultants will include directors, assistant directors, coordinators of special projects and special personnel from colleges and universities. A coordinator will be assigned to work with other personnel involved on room arrangements; agenda, materials, etc., for the workshops.

6.1.3. Scope of the Sessions: The agenda of the 10 sessions will include discussions on the nature of the children in the Middle School, objectives and philosophy of the program, use of the school plant, evaluation, etc. Orientation in relation to the new curriculum for the Intermediate Schools will be stressed. Staff involvement in curriculum development will also be emphasized.

6.1.4. Meeting Place: The April 25th meeting will be held at Washington Irving High School. The 7 small-group workshops will be held in 12 schools located in the 11 district superintendents' areas in which the 12 Intermediate Schools are located.

6.2. For the Staffs of the 58 Feeder Primary Schools, the following teacher-supervisor orientation program will be planned:

6.2.1. Time Schedule: One workshop will be held after school during May.

6.2.2. Personnel: The following staff members from each feeding Primary School will attend: 1 principal, 1 assistant to principal, 2 teachers.

6.2.3. Scope of the Sessions: The session will be held in conjunction with the session attended by the Intermediate School staff. Sessions will be devoted to discussions of the philosophy, objectives, Educational Planning Program, curriculum, etc., of the Intermediate Schools.

6.2.4. Meeting Place: The session for the staff from the feeder Primary Schools will be held at the same time and place as the after-school session for the Intermediate School staff.

Evaluation

The Center for Urban Education was requested to evaluate the project. An evaluation team of eight observers, selected for their expertise in fields with which the program was concerned, attended training sessions and two questionnaires were administered to participants. 91 replies were received from the first questionnaire which was designed to secure information from participants in sessions held in April, May, and June; 363 replies were received from the second questionnaire which sought to secure information from teachers participating in the August workshops. Information from reports written by observers and from responses to questionnaires form the basis of this report.

Orientation Sessions

Central

On April 25, 1966 62 selected members of the professional staff attended a "kick-off" session held at Washington Irving High School. The late Dr. Joseph O. Loretan, Deputy Superintendent, gave an overview of the goals for the new intermediate schools, and the proposed changes in curriculum for grades five and six. More detailed consideration of innovations was presented by other speakers who had been involved with the development of the program. Considerable emphasis was given to the plan of relinquishing the traditional 45 minute periods, and substituting 20 minute "modules." The use of "modules" along with team teaching, it was suggested, would offer greater opportunity for flexibility in programming as required by pupil, teacher, and subject needs.

The experimental nature of the program was stressed and plans for the teacher-supervisor training project were announced.

Time was provided for questions and discussion.

Local

District orientation meetings were held in each of the junior high schools designated as Pilot Intermediate Schools on May 9, 1966. A total of persons from the faculties of the pilot schools and elementary "feeder" schools attended these sessions.

Although the sessions varied in format from school to school, they were concerned with the same topics discussed in the central orientation meeting. District Superintendents, principals, assistant principals, teachers, and, in some instances, consultants not connected with New York City Schools, were discussion leaders.

Observers reported that they sensed considerable insecurity on the part of participants who raised questions about parental reactions, the self-image of pupils grouped according to ability, the restlessness of younger children, and new expectations for teachers. In spite of these questions and possible insecurity, the willingness to cooperate was widespread. In one session, a teacher concluded: "It won't work," and attempted to explain why. Before he had finished stating his objections, the reaction of his colleagues was so obviously one of opposition to his contribution, that the chairman had no need to reply, other than to note that the objector was clearly outnumbered.

Other matters could not be dismissed as easily. Some questions went unanswered because the persons to whom they were addressed lacked the information ("I've attended only one meeting") and because answers to many questions were not available, inasmuch as curricular materials were in the process of being developed.

In each of the sessions, duplicated materials, containing highlights of the plans for the Pilot Intermediate Schools, were used, and, in some instances, a bibliography of suggested readings about middle schools and team teaching was distributed.

When members of the professional staff of the schools, who played a leadership role in this meeting and who later were participants in subsequent training sessions, were asked whether they felt that they had been prepared for this role, 80% replied that they were at least adequately prepared.

b. If "Yes": To what extent were you prepared for your role?

Very well prepared	33%
Adequately prepared	47%
Poorly prepared	9%

Those who felt poorly prepared (20%) gave insufficient advanced notice as the reason.

Spring Training Sessions

Approximately 200 representatives from the designated Pilot Intermediate Schools attended the training sessions held at Brandeis High School on May 16, June 6, and June 20, from 4 to 7 p.m. At each of the sessions participants met in groups determined by curriculum area, and on Wednesday, June 20, prior to group meetings, all participants met together in the auditorium. The Assistant Superintendent in charge of the program discussed some administrative matters and the Deputy Superintendent, spoke about the philosophy of the Pilot Intermediate School program with emphasis on its decentralization. District Superintendents and principals, rather than the central office Board of Education have freedom to experiment.

The Program

Workshop leaders were members of the instructional, administrative, and supervisory staff of the school system. In some instances a member of a group with special expertise changed roles and became discussion leader for a session or part of a session. In all cases, duplicated materials were distributed and used in the workshops; in some instances, demonstrations and audiotapes were also used. The prevailing method of presentation, however, was lecture - discussion, with occasional use of small sub-groups for the performance of specific tasks.

The material presented included the philosophy of the intermediate school, the nature of the specific curriculum with which members of the groups would be involved in August workshops in their respective schools, and methods and materials of instruction consonant with the objectives of the new program and with the stage of development of younger pupils.

The Participants

Those who attended these sessions brought with them considerable professional background. Almost all of the participants (93%) had had experience in the junior high school, while 28% had taught in elementary school and a similar proportion (26%) in high school. Six percent (6%) of the respondents had taught only in the elementary school and 50% had experience only in the junior high school, while 12% had experience in both elementary school and junior high school.

2. How many years of teaching experience have you had in:

	YEARS					
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	Over 25
Elementary grades (N-6)	18%	7%	1%	-	1%	1%
Junior high school grades (7-9)	31%	28%	20%	11%	1%	2%
Senior high school grades (10-12)	22%	3%	-	-	-	-
Other_____ (Please indicate)	6%	3%	-	-	-	-

Most of this experience had been secured within the New York Public Schools. About half of the participants had been employed by the system over 10 years.

3. How many years have you taught in New York City schools?

Years	
1-5	26%
6-10	27%
11-15	24%
16-20	10%
21-25	7%
Over 25	6%

Their educational background ranged from one participant who did not possess a bachelor's degree to one with over 30 credits beyond the 6th year Professional Certificate. Over half of the participants held a master's degree and a considerable number had earned as many as 30 additional credits.

4. Please indicate the highest degree you hold and credits completed beyond your highest degree. (Include in-service credits).

	Credits Beyond				
	0	1-10	11-20	21-30	Over 30
3 year Teacher Training Certificate plus				1%	
Bachelor's degree plus		7%	3%	3%	25%
Master's degree plus	5%	6%	4%	11%	34%
Sixthe Year Certificate plus					1%

Participants' Reactions

The session met from 4 P.M. to 7 P.M. on days in which participants had performed their regular professional duties. Only 20% of the responses to

the questionnaires item about the length of the sessions, however, expressed the feeling that they were too long.

Considering the task to be accomplished, do you think afternoon meetings of three hours were:

Too long	20%
About right length	74%
Too short	6%

The degree to which the time spent in the spring sessions provided participants with the help they needed in selected aspects of the program was indicated in the table below. A majority of the responses to this questionnaire item expressed the need for "much help" in "Scope and sequence of curriculum" and "little help" in "Nature of pupils." In both of these aspects of the training program, participants indicated that the work shop sessions met their needs. Similar congruence between "help needed" and "help received" is found in "Objectives of the curriculum..." in which participants were involved. Apparently, inadequate assistance was given in "Methodology," "Materials, and "Evaluation."

7. Listed below are selected items related to the new curricula. To the left of each item, please check the degree of help you needed; to the right of the item, please indicate the degree of help you received. Other items may be added.

HELP NEEDED				HELP RECEIVED		
Much	Some	Little	Items	Much	Some	Little
40%	37%	23%	Philosophy of the intermediate schl.	23%	50%	27%
40%	38%	22%	Objectives of Curriculum with which you involved	40%	37%	23%
57%	22%	23%	Scope and Sequence of curriculum	40%	36%	24%
24%	26%	50%	Nature of Pupils	13%	35%	52%
42%	36%	22%	Methodology	18%	43%	39%
45%	34%	21%	Materials	23%	37%	40%
43%	42%	15%	Evaluation	13%	32%	55%

In general, however, 69% of the participants felt they were at least adequately prepared to provide leadership in the August workshops to be held in their respective schools.

6. a. To what extent do you feel prepared to conduct the August workshops?

Very well prepared	19%
Adequately prepared	50%
Poorly prepared	31%

Those who had reservations about their preparedness felt that lack of completed curriculum guides, with model lesson plans, and lack of knowledge about team teaching were the cheif deficiencies.

Reactions to clarity of presentation, interest and opportunity for participation are given below. Clarity of presentation was considered good or better by 69% of the respondents; interest of sessions and opportunity to participate were rated good or better by 72%.

9. Evaluate the training sessions with respect to:

a. Clarity of presentation:	Excellent	28%
	Good	41%
	Fair	21%
	Poor	10%
b. Interest of sessions:	Excellent	37%
	Good	35%
	Fair	26%
	Poor	2%
c. Opportunity for you to participate:	Excellent	39%
	Good	33%
	Fair	19%
	Poor	9%

Suggestions for improvement in the questionnaires seemed to reflect a lack of security in the face of change, and desire for more specific concrete and perhaps prescriptive information.

Observers Reactions

Much variation existed within and among the various sessions. In general, there were three discernible categories reported by observers:

(1) Consistently high level of performance and cooperation;

(2) initial resistance which was gradually dissipated;

(3) consistent resistance throughout the sessions. Excerpts from reports of observers illustrating these categories are given below.

(1) The relationships among fourteen pilot teachers--as well as supervisors and a number of observers--with Mr....was free and natural, with liberal and enthusiastic exchange of views. The spirit of cooperation was strikingly evident. It was an excellent example of effective teamwork.

The teachers seemed to have been chosen for their competency and spirit of cooperation and interest.

(2) (Excerpt from first session)

It was obvious that the teachers were not enthusiastic about the curriculum. They raised questions about its purpose and its usefulness. Several of them asked insightful questions that were never answered. They returned reluctantly each time to the discussion of the mimeographed sheets. They were also perturbed about the vagueness of the new organization. It was understandably difficult for them to work on a curriculum which they were not certain had merit for a situation which they could not envision realistically.

(Excerpt from report of second session)

The large group divided itself into the same small workshop groups as in the previous session. Each group was given several skills to react to and change. These changes will be incorporated into the final curriculum....

The group that I was in approached their assignment with high professional competency and understanding. Their suggestions and criticisms were all directed at the goal of making the material more purposeful and meaningful for children. Since all groups remained in the same room it was my impression from observation that a serious professional atmosphere was prevalent.

(Excerpt from report of third session)

> The participants were placed into groups of four. I was asked to join a group that developed a lesson plan for... After these small sessions were ended we again met as a single group.
>
> Dr.... said that he had heard heated discussions and even some indications of pigheadedness--that he was convinced that in addition to obtaining the specific goal of developing lesson plans the teachers were learning to work together--he was pleased to see so much evidence of maturity and good hard thinking.

In this third illustration, the participants neither started with "the spirit of co-operation" nor progressed toward "learning to work together." The group was dealing with probably the most radical departure from the familiar junior high school program. The notion of clustering various subjects around an idea or concept was viewed at times as "too much for us to handle," but at other times as "the way we've always taught." The observer for this group concluded:

> Many of the questions reflect real fear of the unknown and lack of ... desire to try something new.

The lack of enthusiasm for this program was not limited to teachers, but apparently was shared by members of the supervisory staff who would join the group for part of a session, and sometimes make disparaging remarks. One of the leaders of the workshop, an administrator herself, became concerned enough about the disruptive nature of these visits to verbalize her objection. The observer reports:

> Dr.... called to our attention that she had been sitting in the back of the room at the last meeting. She then launched into a tirade. She said she was addressing herself to this group in the hope that they would carry her words to their principals. She commented on the "impossible behavior" of the principals (noted in my previous reports) who drifted in and out at odd intervals.
>
> She took exception to the way in which they came in an hour or an hour and a half after the meeting was in session, listened a few minutes and then delivered themselves of hypercritical, disheartening, and discouraging remarks.

This observer felt that the attitudes revealed in this workshop were particularly unfortunate in view of the quality of material and the spirit in which it was presented. She commented:

> The panel (composed of members of the Task Force which developed the material) has done a tremendous amount of work. The work is good; the demonstrations were excellent.

Most sessions were characterized by good to excellent leadership with ample opportunity for participant involvement as curriculum materials were being developed. What appeared to be participant resistance could be interpreted as apprehensions and concerns. Among these were expressed apprehension over team teaching, evaluation of achievement toward non-content objectives, the availability and proper use of unfamiliar instructional materials.

The chief concern expressed was that of the receptivity of parents, whose orientation is toward learning facts from a textbook, and who may be less than enthusiastic about such goals as critical thinking and self-expression, which are achieved through processes, unfamiliar to them.

August Workshops

The Program

On August 29,30,31, the Pilot Intermediate Schools conducted workshops, in their respective buildings, to provide orientation and opportunity for planning to staff members. General orientation was given in large group meetings; plans for correlation were made in groups of varying sizes, composed of personnel working in related areas; and specialized planning was done in specific subjects by small groups.

On two days, foreign language teachers did not participate in meetings in their schools, but met at the Board of Education. An effort was made by all groups to develop definite plans for the first days of the new term.

Consultants from central and district offices of the Board of Eduaction, from colleges and universities in the Metropolitan area, and members of the professional staff of the individual schools served as leaders.

The Participants

Experience at various school levels was represented in the August workshops as in the spring sessions. 37% had taught in elementary school; 84% in junior high school; and 24% in senior high school. A larger proportion (15%) of the August participants had experience in elementary school only; 45% had only junior high school experience, while 20% had experience in both elementary and junior high school.

2. How many years of teaching experience have you had in:

	YEARS					
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	over 25
Elementary grades (N-6)	28%	8%	3%	1%	-	-
Junior high school grades (7-9)	45%	23%	8%	4%	2	2
Senior high school grades (10-12)	13%	4%	1%	6%	-	-

The majority of the participants had earned credits beyond the bachelor's degree, but less than one-half of them had earned a master's degree.

4. Please indicate the highest degree you hold and credits completed beyond your highest degree. (Include in-service credits)

	Credits Beyond				
	0	1-10	11-20	21-30	Over 30
Bachelor's degree plus	9%	12%	8%	6%	19%
Master's degree plus	5%	7%	4%	5%	23%

Close to half (48%) of the participants had worked in New York City Schools for five years or less.

3. How many years have you taught in New York City?

Years	*
1-5	48%
6-10	28%
11-15	11%
16-20	7%
21-25	3%
Over 25	3%

*The evaluation coordinator overlooked the obvious probability that there would be teachers with no experience. Of the 363 questionnaires returned, 35 responses to the item regarding experience or various grade levels and 43 responses to experience in New York City were unusable. 29 of these, however, indicated that they had had no previous teaching experience.

Participants' Reactions

Responses to the questionnaire item regarding "help needed" and "help received" in specified areas of the program indicate that the needs of the participants were generally met. Apparently this was not true with respect to "materials."

5. Listed below are selected items related to the new curricula. To the left of each item, please check the degree of help you needed; to the right of the item, please indicate the degree of help you received. Other items may be added.

Much	Some	Little	Items	Much	Some	Little
32%	49%	19%	Philosophy of the Intermediate school	38%	49%	13%
37%	41%	22%	Objectives of the Curriculum with which you were involved	42%	43%	15%
49%	37%	14%	Scope and sequence of the curriculum	37%	44%	19%
20%	35%	45%	Nature of pupils	17%	44%	39%
29%	47%	24%	Methodology	20%	57%	23%
41%	38%	21	Materials	23%	41%	36%
25%	54%	21%	Evaluation	17%	53%	30%

93% of the participants felt at least adequately prepared for their roles in the intermediate school.

6. a. To what extent do you feel prepared for your role in the intermediate school?

Very well prepared	28%
Adequately prepared	65%
Poorly prepared	7%

Clarity of presentation was rated good or better by 81% of the respondents; and interest of sessions and opportunities for meaningful participation were rated good or better by 79% and 80% respectively.

7. Please give your evaluation of the workshops with respect to:

a. Clarity of presentation:	Excellent	30%
	Good	51
	Fair	17
	Poor	2
b. Interest of sessions:	Excellent	31%
	Good	46
	Fair	21
	Poor	2
c. Opportunities for meaningful participation:	Excellent	42%
	Good	38
	Fair	17
	Poor	3

Comments of participants included expressions of praise for the "fine" "well planned and implemented" programs which "did all they could do" "under the circumstances". They also suggested the need for "more time for discussion" and for "specific applications."

Recurring comments related to the inadequate supply of syllabi, the dearth of materials, the need for additional staff meetings of teams "for better correlation", and the need for less "philosophy" and "more to the point" discussions.

Observers' Reactions

Each Pilot Intermediate School was visited by at least 3 observers. The spirit in which the workshops were conducted was reported in the following terms:

> Very excited, exciting group, eager to get going.
>
> Staff seems ready to pitch in and try.
>
> Place seemed charged with excitement.
>
> Whole tone, attitude, interest at top level.
>
> The group was working hard and making a sincere effort to prepare in both realistic but imaginative ways...

There were one or two schools in which this spirit did not prevail. In one it was reported that "an aura of disinterest" existed. Other observers saw the principal's role as crucial. One principal opened the first general session by stating that he had not revealed his summer address and that the curriculum material had been received the day before at his home. He admitted that he had not looked at it. At the other extreme, are reports of two observers.

> Dr....sets the atmosphere of cordiality and enthusiasm. It seems that the training program in this school had been enormously successful.
>
> He (the principal) is articulate and well informed.... The apparent high morale of the teachers present may be a reflection of his knowledge and leadership.

Integration

The Project Description prepared by the Board of Education states:

> One purpose of the Middle School will be to achieve more integration. Each of the Intermediate Schools in this project will be located in an area having a large number of disadvantaged pupils or will receive as a result of feeder pattern an adequately integrated student population.

While this report does not deal with pupil population, the integration of the staff may be of interest. In this regard, as in others, apparent variations were found among the schools. Precise information is not available. It was considered undesirable to include an item about ethnic identification. On questionnaires and observers were requested to do the difficult, if not impossible; job of determining the number of "white" and "non-white" participants in the training program.

Observers reported the presence of "non-whites" in all schools and all groups ranging in the case of August workshops from one teacher, to a school with 3 supervisors and close to half of the teachers. "Non-whites" were frequently used as group leaders and consultants.

Summary

In view of the objectives as stated by the Board of Education, and the reactions of participants and observers, the project was, in a large measure, a successful undertaking. The orientation meetings painted in broad strokes the general direction in which changes would be made, and set forth an outline of procedure. The re-iterated suggestion of the need for availability of materials, while having greater validity with respect to the August sessions,

is invalid with respect to the spring training sessions inasmuch as an objective of the program was to involve staff while materials were being developed.

The August workshops, admittedly approached with "a good deal of temerity" by some participants resulted in a substantial feeling of readiness to introduce the new program in the Pilot Intermediate Schools.

MIDDLE SCHOOL

Research Director:

Marshall J. Tyree, Professor, Educational Theory and Application,
Evaluation Coordinator, New York University

Research Staff: (New York University)

Anna E. Balakian, Professor of French

W. Gabriel Carras, Associate Professor, Social Studies Education

Edward M. Carroll, Associate Professor, Mathematic Education

Angiola Churchill, Assistant Professor, Art Education

Lawrence Garfinkel, Instructor, Guidance and Personnel Administration

Janice L. Gorn, Associate Professcr, Educational Theory and Application

Zyra M. Lourie, Instructor, Early Childhood and Elementary Education

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street, N.Y.C

Educational Practices Division
Title I Evaluation
June 20, 1966

The Center for Urban Education has been requested to evaluate the training program related to the introduction of new curricula in the intermediate schools.

As a participant in the program, you are requested to complete the following questionnaire and return it to the discussion leader. Your cooperation in answering with candor will be appreciated. Please do not put your name on the questionnaire.

1. Please indicate the curriculum area meetings in which you participated.

_____

2. How many years of teaching experience have you had in:

	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	Over 25
Elementary grades (N-6)						
Junior high school grades (7-9)						
Senior high school grades (10-12)						
Other_____ (Please indicate) Total						

3. How many years have you taught in New York City schools?

Years	
1-5	_____
6-10	_____
11-15	_____
16-20	_____
21-25	_____
Over 25	_____

4. Please indicate the highest degree you hold and credits completed beyond your highest degree. (Include in-service credits)

	Credits Beyond				
	0	1-10	11-20	21-30	Over 30
_____ Bachelor's degree plus					
_____ Master's degree plus					
_____ Doctor's degree plus					

5. a. Did you have a leadership role in the May 9 meeting at your school?

Yes_____

No _____

b. If "Yes": To what extent were you prepared for your role?

Very well prepared _____

Adequately prepared_____

Poorly prepared _____

c. If "poorly prepared": Indicate reason_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. a. To what extent do you feel prepared to conduct the <u>August</u> workshops?

Very well prepared _____

Adequately prepared_____

Poorly prepared _____

b. If "poorly prepared": Indicate reason _____

_____

_____

_____

7. Listed below are selected items related to the new curricula. To the left of each item, please check the degree of help you needed; to the right of the item, please indicate the degree of help you received. Other items may be added.

Much	Some	Little	Items	Much	Some	Little
			Philosophy of the intermediate school			
			Objectives of curriculum with which you were involved			
			Scope and sequence of curriculum			
			Nature of pupils			
			Methodology			
			Materials			
			Evaluation			
			_____			
			_____			
			_____			

HELPED / NEEDED / HELPED RECEIVED

8. Considering the task to be accomplished, do you think afternoon meetings of three hours were:

Too long _____

About right length _____

Too short _____

9. Evaluate the training sessions with respect to:

a. Clarity of presentation:

Excellent _____

Good _____

Fair _____

Poor _____

b. Interest of sessions: Excellent _____

Good _____

Fair _____

Poor _____

c. Opportunity for you to participate: Excellent _____

Good _____

Fair _____

Poor _____

10. What, if anything, do you need to enhance your readiness for your August assignment?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

11. In your opinion, how could the training sessions have been improved?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Center for Urban Education

August 31, 1966

The Center for Urban Education has been requested to evaluate the training program related to the introduction of new curricula in the intermediate schools.

You are requested to fill in the following questionnaire and return it to your workshop leader. Please do not put your name on the questionnaire.

1. Please indicate the curriculum area with which your workshop was concerned. _____

2. How many years of teaching experience have you had in:

	YEARS					
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	Over 25
Elementary grades (N-6)						
Junior high school grades (7-9)						
Senior high school grades (10-12)						
Total						

3. How many years have you taught in New York City?

Years	
1- 5	_____
6-10	_____
11-15	_____
16-20	_____
21-25	_____
Over 25	_____

4. Please indicate the highest degree you hold and credits completed beyond your highest degree. (Include in-service credits)

	Credits Beyond				
	0	1-10	11-20	21-30	Over 30
_____ Bachelor's degree plus					
_____ Master's degree plus					
_____ Doctor's degree plus					

5. Listed below are selected items related to the new curricula. To the left of each item, please check the degree of help you needed; to the right of the item, please indicate the degree of help you received. Other items may be added.

HELP NEEDED							HELP RECEIVED
Much	Some	Little	Items	Much	Some	Little	
			Philosophy of the intermediate school				
			Objectives of the curriculum with which you were involved				
			Scope and sequence of the curriculum				
			Nature of pupils				
			Methodology				
			Materials				
			Evaluation				
			_____				
			_____				
			_____				

6. a. To what extent do you feel prepared for your role in the intermediate school?

Very well prepared _____

Adequately prepared _____

Poorly prepared _____

b. If "poorly prepared": Indicate reason _____

_____

_____

_____

7. Please give your evaluation of the workshops with respect to:

a. Clarity of presentation:

Excellent _____

Good _____

Fair _____

Poor _____

b. Interest of sessions:

Excellent _____

Good _____

Fair _____

Poor _____

c. Opportunities for meaningful participation:

Excellent _____

Good _____

Fair _____

Poor _____

8. What, if anything, do you think you need to enhance your readiness for the new term?

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. In your opinion, how could the workshops have been improved?

_____

_____

_____